arXiv:1512.04158v1 [math.DG] 14 Dec 2015

Regular Blaschke Para-Umbilical Hypersurfaces in the Conformal Space $\mathbb{Q}_s^n$

Tongzhu Li[1], **Changxiong Nie**[2]

1 Department of Mathematics, Beijing Institute of Technology,

Beijing, China,100081, E-mail: litz@bit.edu.cn

2 Faculty of Mathematics and Statistics, Hubei Key Laboratory of Applied Mathematics,

Hubei University, Wuhan, China, 430062, E-mail: chxnie@163.com

December 15, 2015

Abstract

In [2] we have classified the Blaschke quasi-umbilical submanifolds in the conformal space $\mathbb{Q}_s^n$. In this paper we shall classify the Blaschke para-umbilical hypersurfaces in the conformal space $\mathbb{Q}_s^n$. That may be also considered as the extension of the classification of the conformal isotropic submanifolds in the conformal space $\mathbb{Q}_s^n$.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 53A30; Secondary 53B25.

Key words and phrases: regular submanifolds, conformal invariants, Blaschke para-umbilical hypersurfaces.

§ 1. Introduction.

Let $\mathbb{R}_s^N$ denote pseudo-Euclidean space, which is the real vector space $\mathbb{R}^N$ with the non-degenerate inner product $\langle , \rangle$ given by

$$\langle \xi, \eta \rangle = -\sum_{i=1}^{s} x_i y_i + \sum_{i=s+1}^{N} x_i y_i,$$

[1]T. Z. Li is supported by the grant No. 11571037 of NSFC;

[2]C. X. Nie is partially supported by the grant No. 11571037 of NSFC.

where $\xi = (x_1, \cdots x_{_N}), \eta = (y_1, \cdots, y_{_N}) \in \mathbb{R}^N$.

Let

$$C^{n+1} := \{\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}_{s+1} | \langle \xi, \xi \rangle = 0, \xi \neq 0\},$$
$$\mathbb{Q}^n_s := \{[\xi] \in \mathbb{R}P^{n+1} | \langle \xi, \xi \rangle = 0\} = C^{n+1}/(\mathbb{R}\backslash\{0\}).$$

We call C^{n+1} the light cone in $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}_{s+1}$ and $\mathbb{Q}^n_s$ the conformal space (*or* projective light cone) in $\mathbb{R}P^{n+1}$.

The standard metric h of the conformal space $\mathbb{Q}^n_s$ can be obtained through the pseudo-Riemannian submersion

$$\pi : C^{n+1} \to \mathbb{Q}^n_s, \xi \mapsto [\xi].$$

We can check $(\mathbb{Q}^n_s, h)$ is a pseudo-Riemannian manifold.

We define the pseudo-Riemannian sphere space $\mathbb{S}^n_s(r)$ and pseudo-Riemannian hyperbolic space $\mathbb{H}^n_s(r)$ with radius r by

$$\mathbb{S}^n_s(r) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_s | \langle u, u \rangle = r^2\}, \quad \mathbb{H}^n_s(r) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}_{s+1} | \langle u, u \rangle = -r^2\}.$$

When $r = 1$ we usually omit the radius r. When $s = 1$ and $r = 1$ we call them de Sitter space $\mathbb{S}^n_1$ and anti-de Sitter space $\mathbb{H}^n_1$.

We may assume $\mathbb{Q}^n_s$ to be the common compactification of $\mathbb{R}^n_s$, $\mathbb{S}^n_s$ and $\mathbb{H}^n_s$, and $\mathbb{R}^n_s$, $\mathbb{S}^n_s$ and $\mathbb{H}^n_s$ to be the subsets of $\mathbb{Q}^n_s$ when referring only to the conformal geometry.

When $s = 0$, our analysis in this text can be reduced to the Moebius submanifold geometry in the sphere space (see [4]).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we recall the submanifold theory in the conformal space $\mathbb{Q}^n_s$ and give the relations between conformal invariants and isometric ones for submanifolds in several particular surroundings. In Section 3 we classify the conformal surfaces in $\mathbb{Q}^3_1$. In Section 4 we classify the Blaschke para-umbilical hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{Q}^n_s$.

§ 2. Fundamental equations.

We recall the scheme of submanifold theory in the conformal space $\mathbb{Q}^n_s$ first. A classical theorem tells us that

Theorem 2.1.(see [3]) The conformal group of the conformal space $\mathbb{Q}^n_s$ is $O(n-s+1, s+1)/\{\pm 1\}$. If φ is a conformal transformation on $\mathbb{Q}^n_s$, then there is $A \in O(n-s+1, s+1)$, such that $\varphi = \Phi_A$ and $\Phi_A([X]) = [XA]$.

Suppose that $x : \mathbf{M}^m_t \to \mathbb{Q}^n_s (s \geq 1)$ is an m-dimensional Riemannian or pseudo-Riemannian submanifold with index $t (0 \leq t \leq s)$. That is, $x_*(\mathrm{T}\mathbf{M})$ is non-degenerate subbundle of $(\mathrm{T}\mathbb{Q}^n_s, h)$ with index $t (0 \leq t \leq s)$. When $t = 0$ we

call $\mathbf{M}$ space-like submanifold. When $t > 0$ we call $\mathbf{M}$ pseudo-Riemmanian submanifold. Especially when $t = 1$, $\mathbf{M}$ is called Lorentzian submanifold or time-like submanifold. From now on, we always assume that the submanifold x has index $t(0 \leq t \leq s)$.

Let $y : U \to C^{n+1}$ be a lift of $x : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbb{Q}_s^n$ defined on an open subset U of $\mathbf{M}$. We denote by Δ and ρ the Laplacian operator and the scalar curvature of the local non-degenerate metric $\langle \mathrm{d}y, \mathrm{d}y\rangle$. Then we have

Theorem 2.2. (cf. [3]) Suppose that $x : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbb{Q}_s^n$ is an m-dimensional Riemannian or pseudo-Riemannian submanifold with index $t(0 \leq t \leq s)$. On $\mathbf{M}$ the 2-form

$$g := \pm(\langle \Delta y, \Delta y\rangle - \frac{m}{m-1}\rho)\langle \mathrm{d}y, \mathrm{d}y\rangle$$

is a globally defined conformal invariant of x.

Definition 2.1. We call an m-dimensional submanifold $x : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbb{Q}_s^n$ a regular submanifold if the 2-form $g := \pm(\langle \Delta y, \Delta y\rangle - \frac{m}{m-1}\rho)\langle \mathrm{d}y, \mathrm{d}y\rangle$ is non-degenerate. g is called the conformal metric of the regular submanifold $x : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbb{Q}_s^n$.

In this paper we assume that $x : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbb{Q}_s^n$ is a regular submanifold. Since the metric g is non-degenerate (we call it the conformal metric), there exists a unique lift $Y : \mathbf{M} \to C^{n+1}$ such that $g = \langle \mathrm{d}Y, \mathrm{d}Y\rangle$ up to sign. We call Y the canonical lift of x.

Definition 2.2. The two submanifolds $x, \tilde{x}$ are conformally equivalent, if there exists a conformal transform $\sigma : \mathbb{Q}_s^n \to \mathbb{Q}_s^n$, such that $\tilde{x} = \sigma \circ x$.

It follows from Theorem 2.1 that

Theorem 2.3. Two submanifolds $x, \tilde{x} : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbb{Q}_s^n$ are conformally equivalent if and only if there exists $T \in O(n - s + 1, s + 1)$ such that $\tilde{Y} = TY$, where $Y, \tilde{Y}$ are canonical lifts of $x, \tilde{x}$, respectively .

Let $\{e_1, \cdots, e_m\}$ be a local basis of $\mathbf{M}$ with dual basis $\{\omega^1, \cdots, \omega^m\}$. Denote $Y_i = e_i(Y)$. We define

$$N := -\frac{1}{m}\Delta Y - \frac{1}{2m^2}\langle \Delta Y, \Delta Y\rangle Y.$$

Analogous to the corresponding calculation of [13], we have

$$\langle N, Y\rangle = 1, \langle N, N\rangle = 0, \langle N, Y_k\rangle = 0, \quad 1 \leq k \leq m.$$

We may decompose $\mathbb{R}_{s+1}^{n+2}$ such that

$$\mathbb{R}_{s+1}^{n+2} = \mathrm{span}\{Y, N\} \oplus \mathrm{span}\{Y_1, \cdots, Y_m\} \oplus \mathbb{V}$$

where $\mathbb{V} \perp \mathrm{span}\{Y, N, Y_1, \cdots, Y_m\}$. We call $\mathbb{V}$ the conformal normal bundle for $x : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbb{Q}_s^n$. Let $\{\xi_{m+1}, \cdots, \xi_n\}$ be a local basis of the bundle $\mathbb{V}$ over $\mathbf{M}$.

Then $\{Y, N, Y_1, \cdots, Y_m, \xi_{m+1}, \cdots, \xi_n\}$ forms a moving frame in $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}_{s+1}$ along $\mathbf{M}$. We adopt the conventions on the ranges of indices in this paper without special claim:

$$1 \leq i, j, k, l, p, q \leq m; \quad m+1 \leq \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \nu \leq n.$$

We may write the structural equations as follows

$$\mathrm{d}Y = \sum_i \omega^i Y_i; \quad \mathrm{d}N = \sum_i \psi^i Y_i + \sum_\alpha \phi^\alpha \xi_\alpha; \tag{2.1}$$

$$\mathrm{d}Y_i = -\psi_i Y - \omega_i N + \sum_j \omega_i^j Y_j + \sum_\alpha \omega_i^\alpha \xi_\alpha; \tag{2.2}$$

$$\mathrm{d}\xi_\alpha = -\phi_\alpha Y + \sum_i \omega_\alpha^i Y_i + \sum_\beta \omega_\alpha^\beta \xi_\alpha, \tag{2.3}$$

where the coefficients of $\{Y, N, Y_i, \xi_\alpha\}$ are 1-forms on $\mathbf{M}$.

It is clear that $\mathbb{A} := \sum_i \psi_i \otimes \omega^i, \mathbb{B} := \sum_{i,\alpha} \omega_i^\alpha \otimes \omega^i \xi_\alpha, \Phi := \sum_\alpha \phi^\alpha \xi_\alpha$ are globally defined conformal invariants. Let

$$\psi_i = \sum_j A_{ij}\omega^j, \quad \omega_i^\alpha = \sum_j B_{ij}^\alpha \omega^j, \quad \phi^\alpha = \sum_i C_i^\alpha \omega^i.$$

Denote the covariant derivatives of these tensors with respect to conformal metric g as follows:

$$\sum_j C_{i,j}^\alpha \omega^j = \mathrm{d}C_i^\alpha - \sum_j C_j^\alpha \omega_i^j + \sum_\beta C_i^\beta \omega_\beta^\alpha;$$

$$\sum_k A_{ij,k}\omega^k = \mathrm{d}A_{ij} - \sum_k A_{ik}\omega_j^k - \sum_k A_{kj}\omega_i^k;$$

$$\sum_k B_{ij,k}^\alpha \omega^k = \mathrm{d}B_{ij}^\alpha - \sum_k B_{ik}^\alpha \omega_j^k - \sum_k B_{kj}^\alpha \omega_i^k + \sum_\beta B_{ij}^\beta \omega_\beta^\alpha.$$

The curvature forms $\{\Omega_j^i\}$ and the normal curvature forms $\{\Omega_\beta^\alpha\}$ of the submanifold $x : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbb{Q}_s^n$ can be written by

$$\Omega_j^i = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{kl} R^i{}_{jkl}\omega^k \wedge \omega^l = \omega^i \wedge \psi_j + \psi^i \wedge \omega_j - \sum_\alpha \omega_\alpha^i \wedge \omega_j^\alpha;$$

$$\Omega_\beta^\alpha = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{kl} R^\alpha{}_{\beta kl}\omega^k \wedge \omega^l = -\sum_i \omega_i^\alpha \wedge \omega_\beta^i.$$

Denote

$$g_{ij} = \langle Y_i, Y_j \rangle, \quad g_{\beta\gamma} = \langle \xi_\beta, \xi_\gamma \rangle, \quad (g^{ij}) = (g_{ij})^{-1}, \quad (g^{\beta\gamma}) = (g_{\beta\gamma})^{-1},$$

$$R_{ijkl} = \sum_p g_{ip} R^p{}_{jkl}, \quad R_{\alpha\beta kl} = \sum_\nu g_{\alpha\nu} R^\nu{}_{\beta kl}.$$

Then the integrable conditions of the structure equations are

$$A_{ij,k} - A_{ik,j} = -\sum_{\alpha\beta} g_{\alpha\beta}(B^\alpha_{ij}C^\beta_k - B^\alpha_{ik}C^\beta_j); \quad B^\alpha_{ij,k} - B^\alpha_{ik,j} = g_{ij}C^\alpha_k - g_{ik}C^\alpha_j;$$

$$C^\alpha_{i,j} - C^\alpha_{j,i} = \sum_{kl} g^{kl}(B^\alpha_{ik}A_{lj} - B^\alpha_{jk}A_{li}); \quad R_{\alpha\beta ij} = \sum_{kl\gamma\nu} g_{\alpha\gamma}g_{\beta\nu}g^{kl}(B^\gamma_{ik}B^\nu_{lj} - B^\nu_{ik}B^\gamma_{lj});$$

$$R_{ijkl} = \sum_{\alpha\beta} g_{\alpha\beta}(B^\alpha_{ik}B^\beta_{jl} - B^\alpha_{il}B^\beta_{jk}) + (g_{ik}A_{jl} - g_{il}A_{jk}) + (A_{ik}g_{jl} - A_{il}g_{jk}).$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\mathrm{tr}(\mathbb{A}) = \frac{1}{2m}(\frac{m}{m-1}\rho \pm 1); \quad R_{ij} = \mathrm{tr}(\mathbb{A})g_{ij} + (m-2)A_{ij} - \sum_{kl\alpha\beta} g^{kl}g_{\alpha\beta}B^\alpha_{ik}B^\beta_{lj};$$

$$(1-m)C^\alpha_i = \sum_{jk} g^{jk}B^\alpha_{ij,k}; \quad \sum_{ijkl\alpha\beta} g^{ij}g^{kl}g_{\alpha\beta}B^\alpha_{ik}B^\beta_{jl} = \pm\frac{m-1}{m}; \quad \sum_{ij} g^{ij}B^\alpha_{ij} = 0.$$

From above we know that in the case $m \geq 3$ all coefficients in the PDE system (2.1)-(2.3) are determined by the conformal metric g, the conformal second fundamental form $\mathbb{B}$ and the normal connection $\{\omega^\beta_\alpha\}$ in the conformal normal bundle. Then we have

Theorem 2.4. Two hypersurfaces $x : \mathbf{M}^m_t \to \mathbb{Q}^{m+1}_s$ and $\widetilde{x} : \widetilde{\mathbf{M}}^m_t \to \mathbb{Q}^{m+1}_s (m \geq 3)$ are conformal equivalent if and only if there exists a diffeomorphism $f : \mathbf{M} \to \widetilde{\mathbf{M}}$ which preserves the conformal metric and the conformal second fundamental form. In another word, $\{g, \mathbb{B}\}$ is a complete invariants system of the hypersurface $x : \mathbf{M}^m \to \mathbb{Q}^{m+1}_s (m \geq 3)$.

When $\epsilon = 1, 0, -1$, let the pseudo-Riemannian space form $\mathbf{R}^n_s(\epsilon)$ denote $\mathbb{S}^n_s, \mathbb{R}^n_s$, $\mathbb{H}^n_s$, respectively. Let $\sigma_\epsilon : \mathbf{R}^n_s(\epsilon) \to \mathbb{Q}^n_s$ be the standard conformal embedding(see [3]).

Next we give the relations between the conformal invariants induced above and isometric invariants of $u : \mathbf{M}^m_t \to \mathbf{R}^n_s(\epsilon)$. Let $\{e_1, \cdots, e_m\}$ be an local basis for u with dual basis $\{\omega^1, \cdots, \omega^m\}$. Let $\{e_{m+1}, \cdots, e_n\}$ be a local basis of the normal bundle of u. Then we have the first and second fundamental forms I, II and the mean curvature vector $\overrightarrow{H}$. We may write

$$I = \sum_{ij} I_{ij}\omega^i \otimes \omega^j, \quad II = \sum_{ij\alpha} h^\alpha_{ij}\omega^i \otimes \omega^j e_\alpha$$

$$(I^{ij}) = (I_{ij})^{-1}, \quad \overrightarrow{H} = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{ij\alpha} I^{ij} h^{\alpha}_{ij} e_{\alpha} := \sum_{\alpha} H^{\alpha} e_{\alpha}.$$

From the structure equations

$$\mathrm{d}u = \sum_i \omega^i u_i, \quad \mathrm{d}u_i = \sum_j \theta^j_i u_j + \sum_\alpha \theta^\alpha_i e_\alpha - \epsilon\omega_i u, \quad \mathrm{d}e_\alpha = \sum_j \theta^j_\alpha u_j + \sum_\beta \theta^\beta_\alpha e_\beta,$$

we have

$$\Delta_I u = m(\overrightarrow{H} - \epsilon u), \quad \rho_I = m(m-1)\epsilon + (m^2|\overrightarrow{H}|^2 - |II|^2),$$

where

$$|\overrightarrow{H}|^2 = \sum_{\alpha\beta} I_{\alpha\beta} H^\alpha H^\beta, I_{\alpha\beta} = (e_\alpha, e_\beta); \quad |II|^2 = \sum_{ijkl\alpha\beta} I_{\alpha\beta} I^{ik} I^{jl} h^\alpha_{ij} h^\beta_{kl}.$$

For the global lift $y : \mathbf{M} \to C^{n+1}$, the conformal factor of y is

$$e^{2\tau} = \pm\frac{m}{m-1}(|II|^2 - m|\overrightarrow{H}|^2). \tag{2.4}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\Delta_I u = m(\overrightarrow{H} - \epsilon u), \quad \rho_I = m^2|\overrightarrow{H}|^2 - |II|^2, \tag{2.5}$$

$$A_{ij} = \tau_i\tau_j + \sum_\alpha h^\alpha_{ij} H_\alpha - \tau_{i,j} - \frac{1}{2}(\sum_{ij} I^{ij}\tau_i\tau_j + |\overrightarrow{H}|^2 - \epsilon) I_{ij}, \tag{2.6}$$

$$B^\alpha_{ij} = e^\tau(h^\alpha_{ij} - H^\alpha I_{ij}), \quad e^\tau C^\alpha_i = H^\alpha\tau_i - \sum_j h^\alpha_{ij}\tau^j - H^\alpha_{,i}, \tag{2.7}$$

where $\tau_{i,j}$ is the Hessian of τ respect to I and $H^\alpha_{,i}$ is the covariant derivative of the mean curvature vector field of u in the normal bundle $N(\mathbf{M})$ respect to I.

§ 3. Conformal surfaces in $\mathbb{Q}^3_1$.

In this section let $x : \mathbf{M}^m_t \to \mathbb{Q}^{m+1}_s$ be an m-dimensional regular hypersurface with index $t(0 \le t \le s)$. We use the notations in Section 2 and omit all normal scripts in the formulas because the codimension now is one. Let

$$A^i_j = \sum_k g^{ik} A_{kj}, \quad A = (A^i_j),$$

$$B^i_j = \sum_k g^{ik} B_{kj}, \quad B = (B^i_j).$$

We rewrite some equations occurred preciously in the new form as follows

$$\sum_{ij} B_j^i B_i^j = \frac{m-1}{m}, \quad \sum_i B_i^i = 0, \tag{3.1}$$

$$B_{ij,k} - B_{ik,j} = g_{ij}C_k - g_{ik}C_j, \quad A_{ij,k} - A_{ik,j} = B_{ij}C_k - B_{ik}C_j, \tag{3.2}$$

$$C_{i,j} - C_{j,i} = \sum_k (B_{ik}A_j^k - B_{jk}A_i^k), \tag{3.3}$$

$$\sum_i A_i^i = \frac{1}{2m}(\frac{m}{m-1}\rho \pm 1). \tag{3.4}$$

Definition 3.1. We call an m-dimensional regular submanifold $x : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbb{Q}_s^n$ conformal if the conformal form $\Phi \equiv 0$.

Let $x : \mathbf{M} \to \mathbb{Q}_1^3$ be a regular space-like surface. We can write the structural equations as

$$e_i(N) = \sum_j A_i^j Y_j + C_i\xi, \quad e_i(\xi) = C_i Y + \sum_j B_i^j Y_j, \tag{3.5}$$

$$e_j(Y_i) = -A_{ij}Y - g_{ij}N + \sum_k \Gamma_{ij}^k Y_k + B_{ij}\xi.$$

Since $m = 2$, we can find an orthonormal basis e_1, e_2 of x from (3.1) such that

$$B = \mathrm{diag}(\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}).$$

If x is a conformal surface, we have $C_i = 0, i = 1, 2$. It implies from (3.2) that $B_{ij,k}, A_{ij,k}$ are all symmetric with respect to the subscripts. For the same reason that x has vanishing conformal form, by (3.3), we can modify the orthonormal basis e_1, e_2 such that

$$A = \mathrm{diag}(a, b).$$

Taking i, j various values in

$$\sum_k B_{ij,k}\omega^k = \mathrm{d}B_{ij} - \sum_k B_{ik}\omega_j^k - \sum_k B_{kj}\omega_i^k, \tag{3.6}$$

we have

$$B_{11,i} = B_{22,i} = 0, i = 1, 2.$$

Therefore $B_{12,i} = 0, i = 1, 2$. Letting $i = 1, j = 2$ in (3.6), we get the connection of x is flat, *i.e.*, $\omega_2^1 = 0$. It follows from (3.4) that

$$a + b = -\frac{1}{4}. \tag{3.7}$$

In addition, we may assume that there exist local co-ordinates u, v such that

$$e_1 = \frac{\partial}{\partial u}, \quad e_2 = \frac{\partial}{\partial v}.$$

Taking $i = 1, j = 2$ in

$$\sum_k A_{ij,k}\omega^k = \mathrm{d}A_{ij} - \sum_k A_{ik}\omega_j^k - \sum_k A_{kj}\omega_i^k, \tag{3.8}$$

and noting $\omega_2^1 = 0$, we have

$$A_{12,i} = 0, i = 1, 2.$$

So, when taking $i = j = 1$ and $i = j = 2$ in (3.8) respectively, we know that $a_v = b_u = 0$. Adding (3.7) we shall see that a, b are both constant.

Next, we have the structural equations as the following new form

$$N_u = aY_u, \quad N_v = bY_v, \quad \xi_u = \frac{1}{2}Y_u, \quad \xi_v = -\frac{1}{2}Y_v, \tag{3.9}$$

$$Y_{uv} = 0, \quad Y_{uu} = -aY - N + \frac{1}{2}\xi, \quad Y_{vv} = -bY - N - \frac{1}{2}\xi. \tag{3.10}$$

So, we know from $Y_{uv} = 0$ that Y can be split as

$$Y = F(u) + G(v).$$

Substituting it into the structural equations, we have

$$F''' + (2a - \frac{1}{4})F' = 0, \quad G''' + (2b - \frac{1}{4})G' = 0. \tag{3.11}$$

By (3.7) we have

$$(2a - \frac{1}{4}) + (2b - \frac{1}{4}) = -1. \tag{3.12}$$

In the following we discuss the resolve into three essential cases by noting the character of the coefficients of the above PDEs (3.11).

Case I: $2a - \frac{1}{4} < 0, 2b - \frac{1}{4} < 0$.

Let $2a - \frac{1}{4} = -r^2$. Then $2b - \frac{1}{4} = r^2 - 1$ and $0 < r < 1$. We have a particular resolve

$$F = (r\cosh(ru), 0, r\sinh(ru), 0, 1),$$
$$G = (0, \sqrt{1-r^2}\cosh(\sqrt{1-r^2}v), 0, \sqrt{1-r^2}\sinh(\sqrt{1-r^2}v), 0).$$

And we know that any resolve (Y, N, Y_u, Y_v, ξ) of PDEs (3.9) and (3.10) is different from the initial resolve $(Y, N, Y_u, Y_v, \xi)_0$ up to a isometric transformation T in $\mathbb{R}^5_2$, *i.e.*, $(Y, N, Y_u, Y_v, \xi) = T(Y, N, Y_u, Y_v, \xi)_0$. So

$$Y = F + G := (x, 1)$$

$$= (r\cosh(ru), \sqrt{1-r^2}\cosh(\sqrt{1-r^2}v), r\sinh(ru), \sqrt{1-r^2}\sinh(\sqrt{1-r^2}v), 1)$$

locally determines a surface $x : \mathbb{H}^1(r) \times \mathbb{H}^1(\sqrt{1-r^2}) \to \mathbb{H}^3_1$ whose canonical lift is Y.

Case II: $2a - \frac{1}{4} < 0, 2b - \frac{1}{4} > 0$.

Let $2a - \frac{1}{4} = -r^2 - 1$. Then $2b - \frac{1}{4} = r^2$ and $r > 0$. We have a particular resolve

$$F = (1, r\cosh(\sqrt{r^2+1}u), r\sinh(\sqrt{r^2+1}u), 0, 0),$$
$$G = (0, 0, 0, \sqrt{r^2+1}\cos(rv), \sqrt{r^2+1}\sin(rv)).$$

And we know that any resolve (Y, N, Y_u, Y_v, ξ) of PDEs (3.9) and (3.10) is different from the initial resolve $(Y, N, Y_u, Y_v, \xi)_0$ up to a isometric transformation T in $\mathbb{R}^5_2$, *i.e.*, $(Y, N, Y_u, Y_v, \xi) = T(Y, N, Y_u, Y_v, \xi)_0$. So

$$Y = F + G := (1, x)$$

$$= (1, r\cosh(\sqrt{r^2+1}u), r\sinh(\sqrt{r^2+1}u), \sqrt{r^2+1}\cos(rv), \sqrt{r^2+1}\sin(rv))$$

locally determines a surface $x : \mathbb{H}^1(r) \times \mathbb{S}^1(\sqrt{r^2+1}) \to \mathbb{S}^3_1$ whose canonical lift is Y.

Case III: $2a - \frac{1}{4} = -1, 2b - \frac{1}{4} = 0$.

We have a particular resolve

$$F = (0, \cosh u, \sinh u, 0, 0),$$

$$G = (\frac{v^2}{2}, 0, 0, v, \frac{v^2}{2} - 1).$$

And we know that any resolve (Y, N, Y_u, Y_v, ξ) of PDEs (3.9) and (3.10) is different from the initial resolve $(Y, N, Y_u, Y_v, \xi)_0$ up to a isometric transformation T in $\mathbb{R}^5_2$, *i.e.*, $(Y, N, Y_u, Y_v, \xi) = T(Y, N, Y_u, Y_v, \xi)_0$. So

$$Y = F + G := (\frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{2}, x, \frac{\langle x, x\rangle}{2} - 1)$$

$$= (\frac{v^2}{2}, \cosh u, \sinh u, v, \frac{v^2}{2} - 1)$$

locally determines a surface $x : \mathbb{H}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^1 \to \mathbb{R}^3_1$ whose canonical lift is Y.

Summing up, we obtain

Theorem 3.1 If $x : \mathbf{M}^2 \to \mathbb{Q}_1^3$ is a space-like conformal surface, then it must be locally conformally equivalent to one of the three standard embedding surfaces: $\mathbb{H}^1(r) \times \mathbb{H}^1(\sqrt{1-r^2}) \subset \mathbb{H}_1^3$, $\mathbb{H}^1(r) \times \mathbb{S}^1(\sqrt{r^2+1}) \subset \mathbb{S}_1^3$, and $\mathbb{H}^1 \times \mathbb{R}^1 \subset \mathbb{R}_1^3$, where all radii of sphere or hyperbolic forms should be positive.

Similarly, we shall get

Theorem 3.2 If $x : \mathbf{M}_1^2 \to \mathbb{Q}_1^3$ is a time-like conformal surface, then it must be locally conformally equivalent to one of the five standard embedding surfaces: $\mathbb{H}_1^1(r) \times \mathbb{H}^1(\sqrt{1-r^2}) \subset \mathbb{H}_1^3$, $\mathbb{S}_1^1(r) \times \mathbb{H}^1(\sqrt{1+r^2}) \subset \mathbb{H}_1^3$, $\mathbb{S}_1^1(r) \times \mathbb{S}^1(\sqrt{1-r^2}) \subset \mathbb{S}_1^3$, $\mathbb{R}_1^1 \times \mathbb{S}^1 \subset \mathbb{R}_1^3$, and $\mathbb{S}_1^1 \times \mathbb{R}^1 \subset \mathbb{R}_1^3$, where all the radii of (pseudo-Remannian) sphere or hyperbolic forms should be positive.

§ 4. Blaschke para-umbilical hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{Q}_s^n$.

We remind readers that we shall retain the assumption on the head of Section 2. First, we give the

Definition 4.1. We call an m-dimensional regular hypersurface $x : \mathbf{M}_t^m \to \mathbb{Q}_s^{m+1}$ Blaschke para-umbilical if there exist a smooth function λ, μ on $\mathbf{M}$ such that

$$A = \lambda I_m + \mu B, \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi \equiv 0, \tag{4.1}$$

where I_m means m order unit matrix.

Remark 4.1. This definition is well-defined and it has no matter with the choose of local basis of $\mathbf{M}$. When $n = m+1$, a Blaschke quasi-umbilical submanifold reduces to a Blaschke para-umbilical hypersurface(c.f. [2]).

We have

Proposition 4.1. If $u : \mathbf{M}_t^m \to \mathbf{R}_s^{m+1}(\epsilon)$ is a regular hypersurface with constant scalar curvature ρ_I and mean curvature H, then $x = \sigma_\epsilon \circ u$ is a Blaschke para-umbilical hypersurface in $\mathbb{Q}_s^{m+1}$.

Proof Because of (2.4) and (2.5), we know immediately that $|\overrightarrow{H}|^2$ and $|II|^2$ are both constant. And one can easily see that the conformal factor $e^{2\tau} = \pm\frac{m}{m-1}(|II|^2 - m|\overrightarrow{H}|^2)$ =constant. If the unit normal vector of hypersurface x is space-like (or time-like), then we denote $\varepsilon = 1$ (or -1). By use of (2.6)and (2.7), it follows from above that

$$e^{2\tau} A = \varepsilon H h + \frac{1}{2}(\epsilon - \varepsilon H^2) I_m,$$

$$e^{\tau} B = h - H I_m, \quad C_i = 0, \forall i.$$

If we choose $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}e^{-2\tau}(\epsilon + \varepsilon H^2)$, and $\mu = \varepsilon e^{\tau} H$, we can verify that all the conditions of a Blaschke quasi-umbilical submanifold are satisfied.□

Proposition 4.2. Suppose that $x : \mathbf{M}_t^m \to \mathbb{Q}_s^{m+1}$ is a Blaschke para-umbilical hypersurface in $\mathbb{Q}_s^{m+1}$. Then the smooth function λ in (4.1) must be constant.

Proof Suppose that ξ is the unit normal vector of hypersurface x. Then from (3.1) and (3.5) we get

$$e_i(N) = \lambda e_i(Y) + \mu e_i(\xi).$$

That means,

$$\mathrm{d}N + \lambda \mathrm{d}Y + \mu \mathrm{d}\xi = 0, \tag{4.2}$$

which implies that

$$\mathrm{d}\lambda \wedge \mathrm{d}Y + \mathrm{d}\mu \wedge \mathrm{d}\xi = 0.$$

Letting $\lambda_i = e_i(\lambda), \mu_i = e_i(\mu)$, combining with (3.5) and the vanishing conformal form, we have

$$\sum_{ijk} \lambda_i \omega^i \wedge \omega^j \delta_j^k Y_k + \sum_{ijk} \mu_i \omega^i \wedge \omega^j B_j^k Y_k = 0.$$

Because of the linear independence of $\{Y_1, \cdots, Y_m\}$ and the Cartan's lemma, we have

$$\lambda_i \delta_j^k + \mu_i B_j^k = \lambda_j \delta_i^k + \mu_j B_i^k. \tag{4.3}$$

Because x has vanishing conformal form, by (3.3), we can choose an appropriate orthonormal basis $\{e_1, \cdots, e_m\}$ such that

$$A = \mathrm{diag}(a_i), \quad B = \mathrm{diag}(b_i).$$

For (4.2), fixing i, letting $j = k$, and taking summation over j, it follows from (3.4) that

$$\lambda_i - \frac{1}{m-1} \mu_i b_i = 0. \tag{4.4}$$

Taking $i \neq j = k$ in (4.2), we get

$$\lambda_i + \mu_i b_j = 0, \quad i \neq j. \tag{4.5}$$

From (4.4) and (4.5) we have

$$\mu_i (b_j + \frac{1}{m-1} b_i) = 0, \quad i \neq j. \tag{4.6}$$

If μ_i's are all zero, it follows from (4.4) that λ_i's are all zero. Then λ, μ are both constant over $\mathbf{M}$.

On the contrary, if μ_i's are not all zero, without the loss of generality, we may assume that $\mu_1 \neq 0$, then combining (3.1) and

$$b_i = -\frac{1}{m-1} b_1,$$

we can adjust the orient of the unit normal vector ξ such that

$$b_1 = \frac{m-1}{m}, \quad b_2 = \cdots = b_m = -\frac{1}{m}. \tag{4.7}$$

In the following we adopt the conventions on the ranges of indices

$$2 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq m.$$

Taking i, j various values in (3.6), we have

$$B_{11,i} = B_{\alpha\beta,i} = 0, \forall i.$$

Therefore $B_{1\alpha,i} = 0, \forall i$. Taking $i = 1, j = \alpha$ in (3.6), we have $\omega_{1\alpha} = 0$. Similarly as precious induction in Section 3, we have

$$R_{1\alpha 1\alpha} = 0 = \varepsilon b_1 b_2 + a_1 + a_\alpha, \tag{4.8}$$

where $\varepsilon = \langle \xi, \xi \rangle$. So we know that $A = (a_1) \oplus (a_2 I_{m-1})$. By (4.1) we get

$$a_1 + a_2 = 2\lambda + (b_1 + b_2)\mu. \tag{4.9}$$

Combining (4.7)-(4.9), we get

$$2\lambda + \frac{m-2}{m}\mu = \varepsilon \frac{m-1}{m^2},$$

Therefore

$$2\lambda_1 + \frac{m-2}{m}\mu_1 = 0. \tag{4.10}$$

Taking $i = 1, j = 2$ in (4.5), we have

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{m}\mu_1. \tag{4.11}$$

Substituting (4.11) into (4.10), we get

$$\mu_1 = 0.$$

This is a contraction to the assumption $\mu_1 \neq 0$. So, if $\mathbf{M}$ is connected, then $\lambda = \text{constant}, \mu = \text{constant}$.$\square$

If we take trace of the first equation of (4.1), we will find by (3.4) that

$$m\lambda = \text{tr}(A) = \frac{1}{2m}(\frac{m}{m-1}\rho \pm 1) = \frac{1}{2(m-1)}\rho \pm \frac{1}{2m}. \tag{4.12}$$

which implies that the conformal scalar curvature

$$\rho = \text{constant}.$$

Using the structural equations in Section 2, we have

$$-mN = \Delta Y + \mathrm{tr}(A)Y.$$

From (4.12), we get

$$-mN = \Delta Y + m\lambda Y. \tag{4.13}$$

Therefore by Proposition 4.1 and (4.2) we can find a constant vector $\overrightarrow{c} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+2}_{s+1}$ such that

$$N = \lambda Y + \mu\xi + \overrightarrow{c}. \tag{4.14}$$

It follows from (4.13) and (4.14) that

$$\langle \overrightarrow{c}, Y\rangle = 1, \quad \langle \overrightarrow{c}, \xi\rangle = -\varepsilon\mu^2, \quad \langle \overrightarrow{c}, \overrightarrow{c}\rangle = -2\lambda + \varepsilon\mu^2, \tag{4.15}$$

where $\varepsilon = \langle \xi, \xi\rangle$.

Then we discuss into the following three cases.

Case 1: $\langle \overrightarrow{c}, \overrightarrow{c}\rangle = -2\lambda + \varepsilon\mu^2 = 0$.

By use of an isometric transform of $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}_{s+1}$ if necessary, assume that

$$\overrightarrow{c} = (1, \mathbf{0}, 1).$$

Letting

$$Y = (x_1, u, x_{n+2}),$$

it follows from the first equation of (4.15) and $\langle Y, Y\rangle = 0$ that

$$Y = (\frac{\langle u, u\rangle - 1}{2}, u, \frac{\langle u, u\rangle + 1}{2}).$$

Then x determines a hypersurface $u : \mathbf{M}^m_t \to \mathbb{R}^{m+1}_s$ with

$$I = \langle \mathrm{d}u, \mathrm{d}u\rangle = \langle \mathrm{d}Y, \mathrm{d}Y\rangle = g,$$

which implies that

$$\Delta_I = \Delta, \quad \rho_I = \rho = \text{constant}.$$

We know from [2] that

$$\xi = \varepsilon HY + (0, \zeta, 0), \tag{4.16}$$

where ζ is the unit normal vector of u. It follows from the first and the second equations of (4.15) and (4.16) that

$$H = -\mu^2 = \text{constant}.$$

Then, u is a regular hypersurface with constant scalar curvature and mean curvature in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}_s$. In this case x is locally conformally equivalent to a regular hypersurface with constant scalar curvature and mean curvature in $\mathbb{R}^{m+1}_s$.

Case 2: $\langle \overrightarrow{c}, \overrightarrow{c} \rangle = -2\lambda + \varepsilon\mu^2 := -r^2, r = \text{constant} > 0$.

By use of an isometric transform of $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}_{s+1}$ if necessary, assume that

$$\overrightarrow{c} = (r, \mathbf{0}).$$

Letting

$$Y = (x_1, u/r),$$

by similar method as above we have

$$x_1 = 1/r.$$

So

$$Y = (1, u)/r, \quad \langle u, u \rangle = 1.$$

Then x determines a hypersurface $u : \mathbf{M}^m_t \to \mathbb{S}^{m+1}_s$ with

$$I/r^2 = \langle \mathrm{d}u, \mathrm{d}u \rangle / r^2 = \langle \mathrm{d}Y, \mathrm{d}Y \rangle = g,$$

which implies that

$$r^2 \Delta_I = \Delta, \quad \rho_I = \rho/r^2 = \text{constant}.$$

We know from [2] that

$$\xi = \varepsilon H Y + (0, \zeta), \tag{4.17}$$

where ζ is the unit normal vector of u. It follows from the first and the second equations of (4.15) and (4.17) that

$$H = -\mu^2 = \text{constant}.$$

Then, u is a regular hypersurface with constant scalar curvature and mean curvature in $\mathbb{S}^{m+1}_s$. In this case x is locally conformally equivalent to a regular hypersurface with constant scalar curvature and mean curvature in $\mathbb{S}^{m+1}_s$.

Case 3: $\langle \overrightarrow{c}, \overrightarrow{c} \rangle = -2\lambda + \varepsilon\mu^2 := r^2, r = \text{constant} > 0$.

By use of an isometric transform of $\mathbb{R}^{n+2}_{s+1}$ if necessary, assume that

$$\overrightarrow{c} = (\mathbf{0}, r).$$

Letting

$$Y = (u/r, x_{n+2}),$$

similarly we have

$$x_{n+2} = 1/r.$$

So

$$Y = (u, 1)/r, \langle u, u\rangle = -1.$$

Then x determines a hypersurface $u : \mathbf{M}_t^m \to \mathbb{H}_s^{m+1}$ with

$$I/r^2 = \langle \mathrm{d}u, \mathrm{d}u\rangle/r^2 = \langle \mathrm{d}Y, \mathrm{d}Y\rangle = g,$$

which implies that

$$r^2\Delta_I = \Delta, \quad \rho_I = \rho/r^2 = \text{constant}.$$

We know from [2] that

$$\xi = \varepsilon HY + (\zeta, 0), \tag{4.18}$$

where ζ is the unit normal vector of u. It follows from the first and the second equations of (4.15) and (4.18) that

$$H = -\mu^2 = \text{constant}.$$

Then, u is a regular hypersurface with constant scalar curvature and mean curvature in $\mathbb{H}_s^{m+1}$. In this case x is locally conformally equivalent to a regular hypersurface with constant scalar curvature and mean curvature in $\mathbb{H}_s^{m+1}$.

So combining Proposition 4.1 we get

Theorem 4.1. Any Blaschke para-umbilic hypersurface in $\mathbb{Q}_s^n$ is locally conformally equivalent to a regular hypersurface with constant scalar curvature and mean curvature in $\mathbb{R}_s^n, \mathbb{S}_s^n$, or $\mathbb{H}_s^n$.

Acknowledgements

The authors is deeply grateful to Professor Changping Wang's guidance and inspiration.

References

[1] H. L. Liu, C. P. Wang and G. S. Zhao, *Möbius isotropic submanifolds in S^n*. Tohoku Math. J. **53**(2001): 553-569.

[2] C. X. Nie, *Regular Blaschke Quasi-Umbilical Submanifolds in the Conformal Space $\mathbb{Q}_s^n$*. Chin. J. Comtemporary Math. **36**(2015): 49-58.

[3] C. X. Nie and C. X. Wu, *Regular Submanifolds in the Conformal Space $\mathbb{Q}_p^n$*. Chin. Ann. Math. **33B**(2012): 695-714.

[4] C. P. Wang, *Moebius geometry of submanifolds in $\mathbb{S}^n$*. Manuscripta Math. **96**(1998): 517-534.